1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 5 AT SEATTLE 6 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Case Nos. CR13-310RSL 7 CR09-269RSL Plaintiff, 8 ORDER DISMISSING v. 9 **DEFENDANT'S SECOND** MUHAMMED ZBEIDA TILLISY, 10 MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION AND Defendant. 11 APPOINTMENT OF 12 COUNSEL 13 14 This matter comes before the Court on defendant's "Second Emergency Motion to 15 Substitute Counsel" (Dkt. # 285). Because this case was consolidated with cause no. CR09-16 269RSL on appeal, see *United States v. Tillisy*, No. 22-30151 (9th Cir. Sept. 7, 2022), Dkt. # 2, 17 it also comes before the Court on defendant's identical motion (Dkt. #293) in that case. 18 Pursuant to the reasoning put forth in the Court's previous Order dismissing defendant's 19 request for substitution of counsel, see No. CR09-269RSL, Dkt. # 292; No. CR13-310RSL, Dkt. 20 # 284, the Court dismisses defendant's instant motion for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. 21 Because defendant's cases are now on appeal, any concerns regarding his appointed 22 counsel must be directed to the Ninth Circuit. IT IS SO ORDERED. 23 24 DATED this 7th day of February, 2023. 25 MMS Casnik 26 27 United States District Judge 28 ORDER DISMISSING DEFENDANT'S SECOND MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION AND

APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL - 1